DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 478 CE 074 466

AUTHOR Ares, Nancy; Gorrell, Jeffrey
TITLE Mediated Learning Interactions in Adult Basic Education: Instructors' Responses to Learners' Needs.
PUB DATE Nov 96
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Tuscaloosa, AL, November 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Basic Education; *Adult Educators; Educational Research; Inservice Teacher Education; Interaction; Learning Processes; *Mediation Theory; *Student Needs; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Response; *Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Feuerstein (Reuven); *Mediated Learning Experience

ABSTRACT

A study investigated instructors' responses to learners' needs from the perspective of Feuerstein's Mediated Learning Experience (MLE) theory. Participants were 53 adult educators enrolled in an adult education course at Auburn University. Four scenarios were constructed, each based on one of the five MLE criteria (intentionality, meaning, transcendence, competence, and task regulation). In each situation that depicted adults experiencing learning difficulties, participants were asked to select from five choices the solution they would normally offer students. The choices represented a range of teacher behaviors from noninteractive to highly mediating. A general question was included with each scenario that was aimed at investigating the fifth MLE criterion, feelings of competence. Instructors indicated how they would promote feelings of competence, with choices ranging from nonmediating to highly mediating. Two patterns of responses were found: instructors were either mediating or directing in terms of their intent to facilitate learning and of helping students transfer their learning beyond the particular setting and task at hand, and they were mediating in their approaches to influencing how the meaning and importance of information is perceived and in supporting the use and regulation of strategies in learning tasks. (Appendixes contain 4 tables, 19 references, and instrument.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. CE

ED 409 478

Mediated Learning Interactions in Adult Basic Education: Instructors' Responses to Learners' Needs

Nancy Ares and Jeffrey Gorrell

Auburn University

Presented at the Meeting of

The Mid-South Educational Research Association

Tuscaloosa, Alabama

November, 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CE074466

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mediated Learning Interactions in Adult Basic Education:

Instructors' Responses to Students' Needs

Nancy M. Ares and Jeffrey Gorrell

Auburn University

Vygotsky's theories of the social origins of learning and of mediation have provided the basis for many studies in recent years that focus on understanding learning and teaching (Lidz, 1991; Presseisen & Kozulin, 1992; Rogoff & Gardner, 1984; Wertsch & Minick, 1990). Viewing knowledge as a shared construction and learning and teaching as interactions rather than as transmission and reception have created a marked shift in emphasis toward examining how instructors and learners shape interactions and learning outcomes. This study follows that thread of educational research, treating instructional interactions as learning partnerships in which instructors and learners together create meaning and knowledge.

From this sociocultural perspective, learning and cognitive change emerge from social interaction, with instructors serving as mediators between knowledge and learners. Mediating teachers facilitate student learning by helping expand learners' abilities to learn, to develop effective approaches to learning, and to pose and answer questions. A useful theoretical and practical model for understanding instructors' behaviors is Feuerstein's (1980) Mediated Learning Experience theory, which is grounded in Vygotsky's (1978) theory of mediation and the social origins of learning and cognitive change. According to this theory, individual differences in learning can be attributed to the quality of instructional interactions. Mediators, combining their understanding of the learner's needs, interests, and capacities, structure the learning experience in

a way that promotes effective learning and increases the chances of the learner's profiting from future learning experiences (Klein, Wieder & Greenspan, 1987). Five basic criteria have been established for distinguishing mediating from non-mediating interactions (Feuerstein, 1980; Greenberg, Woodside & Brasil 1993; Klein, Wieder, & Greenspan, 1987; Lidz, 1991):

1) *intentionality* - the intention of the instructor to mediate learning, and the acceptance of that mediation by the learner;

2) *transcendence* - movement beyond the immediate experience toward expansion of the learner's cognitive awareness;

3) *meaning* - behavior by the mediator that influences how information is perceived, how it fits with prior knowledge and how its importance is determined;

4) *competence* - behavior of the mediator that highlights and reinforces the specific processes that lead to success;

5) *task regulation* - modeling, highlighting and supporting the use and regulation of cognitive and metacognitive strategies (Klein, 1988; Klein, Wieder, & Greenspan, 1987; Lidz, 1991).

These five criteria provide a core set of mediating behaviors which potentially influence a learner's level of cognitive change. Klein (1988) found that the "use of these basic criteria of a quality interaction explain variability in nongifted children's cognitive performance . . . better than do some commonly used status variables such as SES, birth weight, APGAR, or early psychomotor test score."(p. 67). In this study, these criteria provided the framework for investigating instructors' responses to learners' needs.

Similar perspectives to those found in sociocultural approaches on the nature of learning

and of learning interactions are found in adult education literature as well. Numerous authors view adult learners as active and involved in the construction of knowledge (Brookfield, 1986; Brundage & Mackeracher, 1980; Knowles, 1980; Mezirow, 1981). Freire (1985), speaking of adults beginning to read and write, asserts that "If learning to read and write is to constitute an act of knowing, the learners must assume from the beginning the role of creative subjects. It is not a matter of memorizing and repeating given syllables, words, and phrases, but rather of reflecting critically on the process of reading and writing itself" (p. 49). In addition, adult education practitioners serving as facilitators is a major factor that some adult education theorists and researchers claimed make the education of adults different from that of children (Houle, 1961; Knowles, 1980), though the claim that adult and child education are qualitatively different has been challenged in more recent years (Brookfield, 1986; Cross, 1981). Brookfield (1986) writes that "Central to the practice of andragogy [adult education] is the fostering of adults' capacity for self-direction, and many adult educators see the fostering of self-directedness as the chief purpose of facilitation" (p. 202). Rather than imparting knowledge, teachers at any level who facilitate learning draw out students' abilities to learn, to be strategic in their approaches to learning tasks, to pose and answer questions. The themes in mediated learning literature and in much adult learning literature are interchangeable: learning and cognitive change result from partnerships between instructors and learners, with instructors facilitating or mediating student learning. Little research drawing on these perspectives has been conducted with adults, therefore this study will help expand our understanding of instructors' roles in learning interactions with adult learners.

Method

Participants: Fifty-three adult educators in Alabama who were enrolled in an adult education

course at Auburn University comprised the sample; 45 are women and 8 are men. Sixty-eight per cent are White, 29.2% are African American, and 2.1% are Native American. Instructors in General Education Diploma (GED) (n=30), Adult Basic Education (ABE) (n=5) and workplace programs (n=5) were represented, as were adult education supervisors (n=2) and volunteers (n=3). Six respondents were either counselors or librarians. County adult education systems, mental health programs, site-based workplace, and corrections programs were represented, as were the federal Job Opportunities through Basic Skills (JOBS) and state Alabama Partnership programs. The range of amount of teaching experience was large, from 6 months to 48 years. The average number of years teaching in adult education was 4.5 (sd=5.038), and the average number of years teaching any age of student was 12.615 (sd=11.030).

The instrument: Four scenarios were constructed, each one based on one of the five MLE criteria (intentionality, meaning, transcendence, task regulation). The situations depicted adults experiencing learning difficulties, for example, not knowing how to identify important ideas and concepts in readings. In each situation, participants were asked to select from five choices the solution they would normally offer students. The choices represented a range of teacher behaviors from non-interactive to highly mediating. A general question was included with each of the four scenarios that was aimed at investigating the fifth MLE criteria, feelings of competence. On that question, instructors indicated how they would promote feelings of competency in each particular situation. The choices offered for that question ranged from non-mediating to highly mediating. The non-mediating choice reflects very general praise, and the highly-mediating choice reflects praise that is specific in nature, highlighting specific processes and strategies that lead to the learner's success (see Appendix).

Data Analyses

Table 1 contains the frequencies of responses to the four scenarios. The four scenarios represent a between-subjects factor, and the range of choices represents a within-subjects factor. For that reason, both chi square and Cochran's Q analyses were conducted to investigate the simple main effects of scenario and choice. Overall and follow-up chi square analyses were used to investigate patterns of responses within each of the four scenarios, and Cochran's Q and McNemar's tests were run to determine whether choice differed significantly across the four scenarios. For all analyses, responses to choice 1 were omitted due to the lack of response of the participants to that category (n=2).

Insert Table 1 here

Results

Scenario - the between- subjects factor: Chi square analyses were conducted to assess whether instructors' choices varied significantly within each of the four scenarios. Holm's sequential Bonferroni method was used to control for Type I error. Table 2 contains the results of the overall and follow-up chi square tests. Values for all four scenarios are statistically significant, with χ^2 (3, $\underline{N}$=52) = 13.547, $p < .00001$ for intentionality; χ^2 (3, $\underline{N}$=53) = 21.1887, $p = .00001$ for meaning; χ^2 (3, $\underline{N}$=52) = 35.2308, $p < .00001$ for task regulation; and χ^2 (3, $\underline{N}$=53) = 50.5283, $p < .00001$ for transcendence. Effect sizes were calculated using the following formula (Green, Salkind, & Akey, 1996):

$$\text{Effect Size} = \frac{\chi^2}{(\text{Total sample size across all categories})(\text{Number of categories} - 1)}$$

A coefficient of 0 indicates that the sample proportion exactly equals the hypothesized proportion, and a 1 indicates that the sample proportion is as different as possible from the one hypothesized. The effect sizes for the chi square statistics found here were .32 for meaning, .23 for task regulation, .19 for intentionality, and .13 for transcendence. All of these are moderate to large, using Cohen's (1988) criteria for judging effect size. These results indicate that instructors' responses varied meaningfully and significantly within each scenario.

Insert Table 2 here

Follow-up chi square tests confirm the pattern of responses found in the frequencies in Table 1. Instructors' response patterns are similar for scenarios representing intentionality and transcendence, with higher frequencies in choices 2 and 5 (n=21 and n=24, respectively, for intentionality; and n=21 and n=21, respectively, for transcendence). Their response patterns are also similar for meaning and task regulation, with higher frequencies for choice 4 (n=27 and 30, respectively). The proportions of instructors who were highly mediating in their responses in terms of intentionality (p=.46) and transcendence (p=.40) are higher than the hypothesized proportion of .25. The same is true of those who were highly directing for those two scenarios (p=.40 for both scenarios). Follow-up tests indicated that the proportions of instructors who were either highly directing or highly mediating differ significantly from those were directing (i.e., choice 3 versus choice 2 for intentionality, χ^2 (1, N=27) = 8.3333, p = .0039) or mediating (i.e., choice 4 versus choice 5 for transcendence, χ^2 (1, N=25) = 11.5600, p = .0007). Similarly, follow-up tests indicated that the proportions of instructors who were mediating in terms of meaning and

task regulation differ significantly from those who responded in the three other choice categories (e.g., choice 4 versus choice versus choice 3 for task regulation, χ^2 (1, N=38) = 12.7368, p = .0004), with the exception of instructors who responded to choice 3 versus those who responded to choice 4 for meaning, χ^2 (1, N=40) = 4.9, p = .0269.

The results of the chi square analyses show that instructors' responses do vary in significantly and meaningfully within the four scenarios, and that their patterns of response are similar for intentionality and transcendence, and for meaning and task regulation.

Choice - the within-subjects factor: Table 3 contains the results of the analyses of the patterns of choices. Cochran's Q tests evaluate differences among related proportions, and were conducted to determine whether choice varied significantly across the four scenarios. The results indicated that choice did vary significantly for each of the four levels investigated, with χ^2 (3, N=50) = 49.7838, p < .00001 for choice 2; χ^2(3, N=34) = 15.8182, p = .0012 for choice 3; χ^2 (3, N=62) = 74.7273, p < .00001 for choice 4; and χ^2 (d, N=54), = 38.3226, p < .00001 for choice 5. Kendall coefficient of concordance values were .33 for choice 2, .16 for choice 3, .40 for choice 4, and .24 for choice 5. These coefficients, indices of the strength of relationships, are moderate to large for all four levels choice, indicating that the differences were meaningful as well as significant.

Insert Table 3 here

Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted using McNemar's tests and controlling for familywise error rate at the .05 level using the Holm's sequential Bonferroni procedure.

Results for choices 2 and 5 were similar, as were those for choices 3 and 4. The proportions differed significantly for choice 2 between intentionality and transcendence (p=.42 for each) and meaning and task regulation (p=.14 and p=.02, respectively). The proportions for choice 5 also differed significantly between intentionality and transcendence ((p=.44 and p=.39, respectively) and meaning and task regulation (p=.11 and p=.24, respectively). For choice 3, meaning (p=.38) differed significantly from transcendence and intentionality (p=.21 and p=.18, respectively). The proportion for task regulation (p=.24) did not differ significantly from any of the other proportions. For choice 4, proportions for meaning (p=.44) and transcendence (p=.06) and for meaning and intentionality (p=.02) differed significantly, while those for meaning and task regulation (p=.48) and for intentionality and transcendence did not.

The results of the within-subjects analyses indicated that instructors tended to be either directing (choice 2) or mediating (choice 5) for intentionality and transcendence, and that they tended to be directing or mediating (choices 3 and 4) for meaning and task regulation.

The patterns seen in the frequencies of responses in Table 1 and confirmed in the above analyses are also found in instructors' responses to the question regarding reinforcing and highlighting the competence of the student, the fifth of the MLE criteria. Table 4 presents the correlations between instructors' responses to the four scenarios and their choices on the question regarding feelings of competence. These results indicate that instructors who tend to be mediating in terms of intentionality and transcendence also tend to be mediating in their responses regarding feelings of competence, and vice versa (r_s = .42, p=.003 and r_s = .28, p=.050, respectively). No significant relationships between instructors' responses to scenarios involving meaning and task regulation and their responses to regarding competence were found.

Insert Table 4 here

Mean numbers of years teaching adults and of years teaching any age of learner were computed and compared using t-tests. Instructors were group according to whether they responded to choice 2 or choice 5 for both intentionality and for transcendence to determine whether teaching experience may be a factor in producing the pattern of response to those two scenarios. No statistically significant difference in the numbers of years teaching adults between the choice 2 group ($\bar{x}$ = 4.14, sd = 4.89) and the choice 5 group ($\bar{x}$ = 4.45, sd = 4.81) were found (t = .26?, $p > .05$). Statistically significant differences in the numbers of years teaching any age learner were also not found for the two groups ($\bar{x}$ = 10.55, sd = 9.95 for choice 2; $\bar{x}$ = 12.99, sd = 10.80 for choice 5; t (33) = .95, $p > .05$). However, a statistically significant and moderate correlation (r_s = .36, p = .01) was found between meaning and years teaching learners of any age, indicating that teaching experience may indeed be related to the MLE criteria used in this study. The small sample size and resulting low power for the tests of the means make it unlikely that a difference would be detected if it did indeed exist.

Discussion

Two patterns of responses were found in the above analyses: 1) instructors are either mediating or directing in terms of their intent to facilitate learning and in terms of helping students transfer their learning beyond the particular setting and task at hand, and 2) they are mediating in their approaches to influencing how the meaning and importance of information is perceived and in supporting the use and regulation of strategies in learning tasks. Analyses of the within-subject

factor of choice and the between-subject factor of scenario support these conclusions, as do the significant and strong correlations among competence and transcendence and intentionality. The criteria combined in the two pairs of scenarios - intentionality with transcendence and meaning with task regulation - can be seen to share a common focus. Intentionality and transcendence concern broader-focus issues in learning, with instructors consciously working to structure the environment and task in such a way as to enhance learners' future learning (intentionality), and also working to expand the learning beyond the task and setting at hand (transcendence). These two criteria for mediated learning interactions can be seen as being more involved with transfer of learning. In contrast, meaning and task regulation are more task- and setting-specific in their focus, with instructors working to enhance learners' abilities to discover meaning and to use strategies on particular tasks in particular settings.

Two factors that are possible contributors to the two patterns of responses are years of teaching experience and participants' interpretation of choices in the instrument designated as directing. The trend in the data that leads us to consider teaching experience as a contributing influence to the bimodal distribution in the transfer-focused scenarios is that instructors with more experience teaching learners of any age tended to choose the mediating response (choice 5) and that those with less experience who tended to choose the directing response (choice 2). The difference in mean number of years teaching was not statistically signficant. However, given the small sample size and its effect on the power of the test, this factor seems to have potential for explaining the pattern in the data. This interpretation makes sense when considering the complexities involved in instructional interactions and the effects of experience on the practice of teaching. More experienced instructors would be expected to be concerned with and to focus on

both task-specific and transfer-related behaviors, while less experienced instructors would be expected to be more concerned with specific tasks (Katz, 1972).

An additional explanation for the patterns found concerns how instructors who chose the directing responses for transcendence and intentionality interpreted those choices. In all four scenarios, those choices depict directing teaching behaviors that involve some form of providing the learner a solution and then assigning a similar task. Instructors who chose the directing responses, who also tended to be mediating in terms of meaning and task regulation, may have interpreted the offering of a solution and providing an opportunity to apply that solution as being sufficiently mediating. In other words, they may be keying in on the providing of new opportunities as the important element, rather than upon who decided on the solution. This may be an example of inexperienced instructors having a less fully-developed understanding of the essence of mediation in instruction.

Conclusions

This study investigated instructors' responses to learners' needs from the perspective of Feuerstein's Mediated Learning Experience theory. Instructors were found to vary their responses based on the situation presented to them and on whether they were focusing on task-specific or transfer-related learning. These findings have implications for understanding instructors' roles in learning interactions and for staff development as well. The adult educators in this study adapted their responses to students' needs. Thus, viewing learning as a partnership and instructors as mediators aptly describes their responses in their work with adult learners. More research built upon those perspectives should further expand our understanding of learning interactions and partnerships.

In addition, further studies into the influence of teaching experience on mediation in instruction would also expand our knowledge base. Should the trend found here be confirmed, support for less-experienced instructors could include or expand specific emphasis on teaching behaviors that encourage transfer of knowledge, strategies and skills beyond specific skills and settings.

Table 1: Frequencies for instructors' choices in response to four scenarios.

		Choice				
		Non-interactive		Directing		Mediating
Mean	**Scenario**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
3.52	Intentionality	1	21	6	1	24
3.48	Transcendence	0	21	7	4	21
4.02	Task Regulation	1	1	8	30	13
3.60	Meaning	0	7	13	27	6

Table 2. Results of overall and follow-up chi square analyses for the four scenarios.

Overall				
Scenario	χ^2	**df**	**N**	**p**
Intentionality	29.0769	3	52	<.00001
Meaning	21.1887	3	53	.0001
Task regulation	35.2308	3	52	<.00001
Transcendence	50.5283	2[a]	53	<.00001

Follow-up					
Scenario	**Choices**	χ^2	**df**	**N**	**p**
Intentionality	2 versus 3	8.3333	1	27	.0039[b]
	2 versus 5	0.2000	1	45	.6547
	3 versus 4	3.5714	1	7	.0588
Meaning	2 versus 3	1.8000	1	20	.1797
	3 versus 4	4.9000	1	40	.0269
	3 versus 5	2.5789	1	19	.1083
Task regulation	2 versus 3	5.4444	1	9	.0196
	3 versus 5	1.1905	1	21	.2752
	4 versus 5	6.7209	1	43	.0095[c]
Transcendence	2 versus 3	7.0000	1	28	.0082[d]
	2 versus 5	-------[e]			
	3 versus 4	0.8182	1	11	.3657

Note: p-values were determined using Holm's sequential Bonferroni method.

[a]The degrees of freedom for transcendence is two because two of the cell have equal frequencies.

[b]The critical value of p = .0125.

[c]The critical value of p = .025.

[d]The critical value of p = .05.

[e]No chi square value was computed because the cell frequencies are equal.

Table 3: Results of Cochran Q and McNemar tests investigating choice across scenarios.

Cochran Q Tests					
Choice	**Cochran's Q**	**df**	**n**	**p**	**Kendall *W***
2	49.7838	3	50	<.001	.33
3	15.8182	3	34	.001	.16
4	74.7273	3	62	<.001	.40
5	38.3226	3	54	<.001	.24

McNemar Tests	
Choice 2	**p**
Meaning with task reg.	.031
Meaning with transcen.*	<.001
Intent. with transcen.	1.000
Intent with task reg.*	<.001
Choice 3	**p**
Meaning with task reg.	.063
Intent. with meaning*	.016
Intent. with task reg.	.500
Meaning with transcen.*	.031
Choice 4	**p**
Meaning with task reg.	.250
Meaning with transcen.*	<.001
Intent. with transcen.	.250
Intent. with meaning*	<.001
Choice 5	**p**
Meaning with task reg.*	.016
Task reg. with transcen.*	.008
Meaning with transcen.*	<.001
Intent with transcen.	.250

17

Table 4: Spearman correlation coefficients for instructors' responses to the four scenarios and to the question regarding competence.

Scenario	Correlation
Intentionality	.42* (.003)
Transcendence	.28* (.050)
Task regulation	-.05 (.736)
Meaning	.15 (.303)

Note: Values in parentheses are exact probabilities. *p<.05.

References

Brookfield, S. (1986). *Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brundage, D., and Mackeracher, D. (1980). *Adult Learning Principles and Their Application to Program Planning.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Power Analysis.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cross, P. (1981). *Adults as Learners.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Feuerstein, R.A. (1980). *Instrumental Enrichment: An Intervention Program for Cognitive Modifiability.* Baltimore: University Park Press.

Freire, P. (1985). *ThePolitics of Education: Culture, Power and Liberation.* New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Green, S.B., Salkind, N.J., Akey, T.M. (1996). *Using SPSS for Windows: Analyzing and Understanding Data* (in press). New York: Prentice-Hall.

Greenberg, K.H., Woodside, M.R., & Brasil, L. (1993). Differences in the degree of mediated learning and classroom structure for trained and untrained teachers. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 29(2),* 1-9.

Houle, C. (1961). *The Inquiring Mind.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Katz, L. (1972). Developmental stages of preschool teachers. *Elementary School Journal, 73,* 50-54.

Klein, K.H. (1988). Stability and change in interaction of Israeli mothers and infants. *Infant Behavior and Development, 11,* 55-70.

Klein, K.H., Wieder, S. & Greenspan, S.I. (1987). A theoretical overview and empirical study of mediated learning experience: Prediction of preschool performance from mother-infant interaction patterns. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 8(2),* 110-129.

Knowles, M.S. 1980). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education.* New York: Association Press.

Lidz, C. (1991). *Practitioner's Guide to Dynamic Assessment.* New York: Guildford Press.

Mezirow, J.D.(1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. *Adult Education, 32*(1),3-24.

Presseisen, B.Z. & Kozulin, A. (1992). *The Contributions of Vygotsky and Feuerstein in Theory and Practice.* A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Rogoff, B. & Gardner, W. (1984) Adult guidance in cognitive development. In B. Rogoff & J. Lave (Eds.), *Everyday Cognition: Its Development in Social Context.* (pp. 95-114). Cambridge MA.: Harvard Univ. Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Developmental of Higher Mental Processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. & Minick, N. (1990). Negotiating sense in the zone of proximal development. In M. Schwebel, C. Maher, & N. Fagley (Eds.), *Promoting Cognitive Growth Over the Life Span.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Appendix

Survey for Mediated Learning Interaction Study

In your work in adult education, you encounter many varieties of learning problems. The following questions are related to the interactions between you and your students when certain kinds of problems arise, and are designed to help us understand how adult educators respond to certain situations.

Participation in completing this questionnaire is voluntary. All information collected will remain confidential. By returning the questionnaire, you are consenting to the use of your responses for research. Individual data will never be revealed in any use of this information.

A. What is your position (i.e., GED instructor, tutor, ESL teacher, etc.)?

_____

B. In what program do you work?

_____

C. Number of years teaching experience, including this year: _____

D. How long have you been working in Adult Education? _____

E. Subjects you teach: _____

F. Gender (circle one): Female Male

G. Ethnicity (circle one): Hispanic Caucasian African American Asian Native American Other

H. Certificate rank (AA, A, B, other): _____

A learner in your class or program is having trouble concentrating on the tasks at hand, and complains of being easily distracted and very frustrated.

(a) What action would you normally take (choose one)?

___ Ask the learner to try to ignore the distractions or to deal with those frustrations, and to concentrate on the task at hand

___ Note what frustrations or distractions the learner is experiencing, and then suggest ways for the learner to change them

___ Ask the learner what he or she sees as potential distractions or frustrations, and help explore ideas for overcoming them

___ Provide the learner with a work space that reduces distractions and/or offer simplified versions of learning tasks

___ Describe what you see as potential distractions or frustrations, and ask the learner for suggestions for overcoming them

(b) In more general terms, would you normally (choose one):

___ Praise the learner for making a good effort ("You really worked hard!")

___ Acknowledge success and ask the learner what specific things were done that led to that success ("That's great! What did you do this time that worked so well?")

___ Encourage the learner with positive comments ("Good work! You are doing very well!")

___ Point out what the learner did that led to success ("You used that strategy really well, and it shows in your work.")

A learner in your class or program does not perceive what is being learned as being relevant to his or her life outside the c'ass. This creates difficulties, and also results in the learner becoming bored with learning that seems irrelevant and meaningless to him or her.

(a) What action would you normally take (choose one)?

___ Explore with the learner how what is being learned can be applied specifically to his or her own life

___ Show the learner how what is being learned relates to his or her own life

___ Remind the learner that all learning is relevant

___ Ask the learner to think about how what is being learned might relate to his or her own life

___ Provide examples that show that what is being learned is relevant to people's lives

(b) In more general terms, would you normally (choose one):

___ Praise the learner for making a good effort ("You really worked hard!")

___ Acknowledge success and ask the learner what specific things were done that led to that success
("That's great! What did you do this time that worked so well?")

___ Encourage the learner with positive comments ("Good work! You are doing very well!")

___ Point out what the learner did that led to success
("You used that strategy really well, and it shows in your work.")

A learner in your class or program is having trouble starting assignments. Sometimes the learner attempts several different approaches, but at other times, he or she feels at a loss as to how to proceed.

(a) What action would you normally take (choose one)?

___ Remind the learner of similar tasks where success was achieved and suggest the use of the same approach

___ Ask which one approach is preferred and then help the learner adapt that approach to the task

___ Tell the learner which approach or strategy to use, and assign a similar task

___ Assign a task similar to those the learner has trouble starting, and ask him or her to try again

___ Help the learner get started by modeling a particular approach, and then asking the learner how to proceed

(b) In more general terms, would you normally (choose one):

___ Praise the learner for making a good effort ("You really worked hard!")

___ Acknowledge success and ask the learner what specific things were done that led to that success
("That's great! What did you do this time that worked so well?")

___ Encourage the learner with positive comments ("Good work! You are doing very well!")

___ Point out what the learner did that led to success
("You used that strategy really well, and it shows in your work.")

A learner in your class or program has been having difficulty identifying the most important ideas and concepts in short readings. This difficulty is reflected in the learner's struggles to write essays in response to those readings. You and the learner have worked to ensure that vocabulary, grammar and other mechanics of writing are not the main source of the problem, but the essays don't focus on the main idea or respond to specific questions in the assignment.

(a) What action would you normally take (choose one)?

___ Give the learner a sample essay that focusses on the important ideas in a reading, and assign an essay based on that same reading

___ Ask how the learner thinks information in the reading can be used to write the essay, and then assist in the writing of another essay

___ Model for the learner how to pinpoint important information in the essay, and then assist the student in writing another essay

___ Highlight the important information in a reading, and suggest ways for the learner to incorporate that information into an essay

___ Assign another reading and another essay, and encourage the learner to write an essay that is more focussed on main ideas in the reading

(b) In more general terms, would you normally (choose one):

___ Praise the learner for making a good effort ("You really worked hard!")

___ Acknowledge success and ask the learner what specific things were done that led to that success
("That's great! What did you do this time that worked so well?")

___ Encourage the learner with positive comments ("Good work! You are doing very well!")

___ Point out what the learner did that led to success
("You used that strategy really well, and it shows in your work.")

Think of a particular interaction with a learner, an interaction that you would identify as one of the best you have experienced. Please be as specific as you can in response to the following questions about that experience. Use the back of the page or additional sheets if you need more space to describe the interaction.

1) What was the setting (i.e., large class, small group, one-on-one interaction)? What learning task was the focus?

2) What did you do that made the interaction a successful one? Please be specific.

3) How did the learner contribute to the success? Again, please be specific.

4) What do you feel is the most important outcome for you as an educator from that interaction?

5) What do you feel is the most important outcome for the learner from that interaction? What do you think the learner valued most from that interaction?